UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/796,604	03/08/2004	Richard S. Bein	355492-2971	1765
88984 FOLEY & LAR	7590 03/25/201 RDNER LLP	EXAMINER		
975 PAGE MIL		SAMALA, JAGADISHWAR RAO		
Palo Alto, CA 9	74304		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1618	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/25/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/796,604	BEIN ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
JAGADISHWAR SAMALA	1618	

	JAGADISHWAR SAMALA	1618				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 22 February 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.				
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperior Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of a replies: (1) an amendment, affidavieal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request			
a) The period for reply expires <u>i</u> months from the mailing date of	of the final rejection.					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(the content of the co	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE f).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FII	n. LED WITHIN TWO			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount or chortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as			
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the				
AMENDMENTS						
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	nsideration and/or search (see NOTw);	ΓE below);				
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially rec	auding or simplifying ti	ie issues ior			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.125. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).			
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	·	•	_			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a			
10.	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.			
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. 	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:			
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)					
	/Jake M. Vu/ Primary Examiner, A rt U	nit 1618				

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that the term "consisting essentially of" eliminates materials that significantly alter the composition. As to Porter and Patterson, the addition of a rheological modifier alters the composition to allow it to be more flowable. In the absence of the rheological modifier, the flowability concerns arising from a higher weight percent of contrast agent have yet to be met. This argument is not persuasive because "consisting essentially of occupies a middle ground between closed claims and that are written in a consisting of format and fully open claims that are drafted in a comprising format". Further Porter and Patterson teaches that addition of rheological modifier imparts high viscosity to the composition under static conditions, yet permit the composition to flow freely under shear stress, a property which applicant is claimed (composition having high viscosity).

Applicant further argues that the composition of Dure-Smith are not direct intravascular microcatheter injection, as they would not be compatible with blood and could form insoluble droplets and are not relevant to the invention as claimed. This argument is not persuasive because this reference is combined for its teachings of knowledge in the art of contrast media composition containing tantalum metal from about 20% to about 70% by weight and that finely divided tantalum metal is completely inert and is not toxic to body tissue when incorporated in to composition in physiologically and pharmaceutically acceptable amounts.

Claims 25-29 rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6 of US Pat. 5,667,767 and claims 1-8 and 16-23 of US Pat. 5,695,480 are maintained for reasons of record in the previous office action. The term "about" indicates a range centered on the recited values. In this case "about" indicates values both above and below 45%. Therefore, what values are included in the range of about 40% would include close to 45% as claimed.